

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/008,748

**Applicant(s)**

PAULSEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Aaron L Enatsky

**Art Unit**

3713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Aaron L Enatsky.(3) David L. Newman.(2) Mike O'Neill.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 August 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 18, 25-30 and 40.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 5,605,506 to Hoorn et al. & US 6,265,984 to Molinaroli.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed arguments submitted in paper number 11. Examiner stated that current arguments are not convincing. An elaboration of Examiner arguments will be provided in the next office action. Applicant also inquired of the status of claims 25-30, which were not clearly addressed in the Final Office action. Examiner pointed out the location of the claims in dispute, which were contained in the Final Office action. Examiner also stated that the Rule 132 Declaration that was provided, was not held as convincing. The declaration is predominately comprised of allegations and opinions of Applicant, which lacked factual evidence. Applicant also inquired about the status of 3 specific embodiments in pending, but rejected claims. Examiner stated, as held in the previous office actions, the various designs are considered lacking criticality to functionality. Molinaroli teaches various embodiments of LED display arrangements, of which teach that LED displays can be arranged in a plurality of ways..